

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47562

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: August 12, 2020</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
WILLIAM R. DIXON,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

---

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Boundary County. Hon. Barbara A. Buchanan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before GRATTON, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

William R. Dixon entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to possession of a controlled substance (methamphetamine) and possession of drug paraphernalia. Idaho Code §§ 37-2732(c)(1) and 37-2734A. The district court sentenced Dixon to a unified term of four years with two years determinate on the possession of a controlled substance charge and forty-six days in jail with credit for time served on the drug paraphernalia charge. Dixon appeals asserting that the district

<sup>1</sup> See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence on the possession of a controlled substance charge.<sup>2</sup>

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Dixon's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dixon does not challenge the forty-six days of jail imposed in a separate judgment on the paraphernalia charge.